



YAKUP KADRİ KARAOSMANOĞLU'NUN BİR SÜRGÜN ROMANINDA KİMLİK, YABANCILAŞMA VE KÜLTÜREL EGEMENLİK

Emre SAY¹

Özet

Bu makale, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu'nun 20.yüzyılın başlarında geçen Bir Sürgün başlıklı romanının tipik bir Jön Türk portresi çizen şanssız baş kahramanı Doktor Hikmet'in zihin dünyası, kademeli olarak yaşadığı hayalkırıklığı ve kendi ölümüyle sonuçlanan hezimetini üzerinde yoğunlaşarak kimlik, yabancılaşma ve kültürel üstünlük konularını irdelemektedir. Bu bağlamda, romanın geçtiği ve Doktor Hikmet'in karakterinin şekillenmesinde de önemli rol oynayan dönemin toplumsal iklimi ve tarihi koşulları da dikkate alınıp bunlara değinilmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Jön Türkler, Kültürel Egemenlik, Paris

IDENTITY, ALIENATION, AND CULTURAL HEGEMONY IN YAKUP KADRİ KARAOSMANOĞLU'S BİR SÜRGÜN (AN EXİLE)

Abstract

This paper explores the topics of identity, alienation, and cultural hegemony in Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu's Bir Sürgün (An Exile) set in the first decade of the 20th century by focusing on the miserable protagonist Doktor Hikmet's dispositional depiction as an earnest adherent of Western Civilization embodied in the epithet of Jeune Turc, gradual disillusionment, and eventual failure with reference to the backdrop of sociological atmosphere as well as historical circumstances by which Doktor Hikmet's frame of mind is extensively influenced and against which the novel is set.

Key Words: Jeunes Turcs, Cultural Hegemony, Paris

¹Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı, realbetissevilla@gmail.com.



To cast an inquisitive glance at the state of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, at the beginning of the century in 1807 Janissaries, under the leadership of Kabakçı Mustafa, set up a revolt against Sultan Selim-III (1789-1807) in a way as to oblige him to abolish the Nizam-ı Cedid army which had been established by Selim-III in 1793 with a view to contributing to the reformation process of the Ottoman Army. Janissaries temporarily succeeded in their violent attempt as they reaped the harvest of their sown seeds on the ploughed turf of the declining Ottoman court by precipitating the coercive abrogation of Nizam-ı Cedid army as well as forcible enthronement of Selim-III which was consequently consummated (!) with his 'bloodless' assassination - he was strangled without shedding a single drop of blood (!) - through the command of the succeeding Sultan Mustafa-IV in 1808 with the prospect of impeding Selim-III's attempt at recapturing the throne via the aid of Rustchuk governor Alemdar Mustafa Pasha. Nonetheless, Mustafa-IV's reign lasted merely for a year as he was coerced to be enthroned by Alemdar Mustafa Pasha and his supporters. Subsequently, he was replaced by Mahmut-II again through the initiative of Alemdar Mustafa Pasha in 1808. Eventually, during an act of mutiny initiated by Janissaries in order to restore him back to the Ottoman throne, Mustafa-IV was murdered through Mahmut-II's order.

Like Selim-III, Mahmut-II can be deemed as a reformatory sultan as he attached great importance to the fulfillment of amendments in military, administrative, educational, legal fields as well as cultural life. In this respect, as a primary self-assertive stride towards the accomplishment of required reformation process, in 1808 Mahmud-II founded the Sekban-ı Cedid army in stead of coercively 'annihilated' Nizam-ı Cedid Army as a preliminary step in the reformation of the army. Accordingly, in a way as to wind up military reformation he intended to attain, he strode a considerably courageous step in 1826 as he abolished the Janissary Corps which is named as The Auspicious Incident (Vaka-i Hayriye) and replaced it with a new military organization called Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammediye. Furthermore, to a remarkable extent, he laid importance on the accomodation of the Ottoman Empire to European ways of life so as to be able to prevent further deterioration and inauspiciously approaching decline. In this regard, he issued a restricted clothing reform (1829) prohibiting civil servants' wearing kavuk, sarık, şalvar, and çarık. In stead, civil servants were required to wear trousers, jacket, and fez so that they would resemble their European counterparts in terms of outlook as much as possible. Mahmud-II adapted himself to the clothing reform as he abandoned the habit of wearing şalvar and adopted trousers as his clothing like his European counterparts. In addition, he had his portrait hung on the walls of governmental offices. Influenced by the management of some Western institutions, he had a census - excluding women - conducted in the empire (1831). During Mahmud-II's reign, for the first time, permanent embassies were launched in major capitals of Europe. Again as a noteworthy novelty, the first official newspaper called *Takvim-i Vekayi* was published in 1831. In addition to madrasahs, schools providing Western way of education where courses like maths, natural sciences, French were taught institutioned. Besides, for the first time, promising students were dispatched to major European cities, notably Paris and Berlin, to fulfill their education there in modern Western institutions with the prospect of enabling them to acquire a close acquaintance with admirable exalted European culture. In this sense, these students sent to Europe can be



asseverated as early pioneers of Young Ottomans and Jeunes Turcs (Young Turks) whose open-minded outlook, cultivated faculties, and intellectual heritage paved the way for the declaration the 1st Constitutional Era and the 2nd Constitutional Era. Taken into consideration the circumstances of the Age and the staunch religious convictions highlighting the Islamic majority of the mostly reactionary Ottoman society, these reforms issued by Mahmud-II with the fairly starry-eyed expectation of enabling the society to internalize them resounded almost revolutionary and, needless to mention, were mostly dismissed by the conservative Islamic society constituting by far the majority of the population. In this regard, it comes as no big surprise that Mahmud-II was derogatorily nicknamed as gavur padishah.

Mahmud-II was succeeded by his son Abdülmecit-I after his death in 1839. Like his father, Abdülmecit-I can readily be deemed as a reformatory sultan as he was provided with proper European style of education and thus endowed with an intellectual background characterizing European intelligentsia of his time. He bred a keen taste for Western style of music. Moreover, he was able to communicate in French fluently just like Karaosmanoğlu's pitiable protagonist Doktor Hikmet in *Bir Sürgün (An Exile)*. Almost as soon as Abdülmecit-I had ascended to the Ottoman throne, Tanzimat Fermanı (Hatt-i Sharif of Gülhane) was proclaimed at the Gülhane Park on November 3 in 1839 at the commandment of the grand vizier Mustafa Reşid Pasha and hailed as a primordially huge step towards the structuralization of a democratic state which is also noted by İlber Ortaylı in his book entitled *Gelenekten Geleceğe* as he deems the declaration of Tanzimat Fermanı as the genesis of Turkish Modernization: “Bana kalırsa ve ille de bir tarih lazımsa, insanların insana layık güvenceyi elde ettikleri 1839 Gülhane Fermanı'nın okunduğu gün derim.” (Ortaylı 16). In 1856 towards the end of The Crimean War which was bound to mark a decisive defeat for the Ottomans; England, France, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire compelled Ottoman Empire to issue a declaration called Islahat Fermanı ensuring non-Islamic minorities' enjoying equal rights with the Musulman majority. Islahat Fermanı can be appraised as a repetition, further elucidation, and enhancement of Tanzimat Fermanı as non-Islamic communities were theoretically bestowed upon the right of enjoying liberties at an equal level with the Islamic majority. Sultan Abdülmecit-I died of tuberculosis at an early age just like Doktor Hikmet in *Bir Sürgün*.

During the reign of Abdülaziz, reformatory half-brother of Abdülmecit and an admirer of Western Civilization, a picnic was arranged in 1865 in the picturesque Forest of Belgrade beyond the small hills of the Bosphorus in İstanbul. Attenders of this picnic were six young, self-assertive, highly-cultivated men who “had been working at one time or another in the Translation Bureau of the Porte, and ... had thus been given the opportunity to acquaint themselves with European political systems” (Mardin 11) thanks to their high proficiency in French in a way evocative of Doktor Hikmet's vast knowledge of French culture as well as his native-like adeptness at the use of French language. Attenders of this casual, unceremonious convention were Mehmed Bey, Nuri Bey, Reşad Bey, Namık Kemal Bey, Ayetullah Bey, and Refik Bey. Highly influenced by the discourse of French philosophers of the Enlightenment, particularly inspired by Montesquieu and Rousseau, they internalized the major principles of the French Revolution which were liberty, equality, fraternity, nationalism, and repudiation of feudalism along with absolute monarchy. These young, self-confident, vehement intellectuals who were



primarily called Young Ottomans “decided to form a society whose aim was to change 'absolute into constitutional rule' in the empire” (Mardin 13) and eventually, though temporarily, accomplished their aim through Abdülhamid-II's declaration of Kanun-i Esasi on 23 December 1876 which marked the beginning of the short-term Birinci Meşrutiyet (First Constitutional Era). This parliamentary monarchy regime which Young Ottomans had been craving for lasted hardly more than one and a quarter year as Abdülhamid-II abrogated the Constitution, dissolved the Parliament (Meclis-i Mebusan), and thus put an end to the First Constitutional Era in February 1878.

After the abolition of the First Constitutional Era, Abdülhamid-II asserted himself as a despicable, revolting, totalitarian tyrant figure quite deservedly among those young angry cultivated men who were now beginning to be referred to as Jeunes Turcs (Young Turks) rather than Young Ottomans. No more did they seek for a compromise between the sultan and the nation that would enable the sultan to perpetuate his absolute authority. Such a 'modest' subservient agreement (!) would not appeal to them at all and not serve to the extinguishment of the kindled fire of freedom glittering ablaze in the core of their hearts. Simply they would not yield to be appeased like a tiny abject enslaved scrawny child-beggar crippled on crutches and accustomed to be whacked, whipped, chastised, or insulted. What they hankered after was a true constitutional democracy: “Die Jungtürken wandten sich gegen das verkrustete System des Sultans, wollten es abschaffen und in einen modernen Verfassungsstaat umwandeln.” (<http://lernportal.the-unwanted.com>) (Jeunes Turcs inveighed against/revolted against the corrupt regime of the Sultan; they wanted to annihilate and transform it into a modern constitutional democracy.) In the novel Jeunes Turcs' abhorrence towards Abdülhamid-II is strikingly conveyed in agent Cemal's following humourous, disdainful statements in Athens: “ ‘A, haberiniz yok mu? Müşarünileyh yolcu imiş. Son günlerde gene kanseri tepmiş.’ / ‘Kim bu müşarünileyh?’ / ‘Abdülhamit keratası; be birader.’ . . . Hele Pire'ye dönüşte treni beklerken acenta Cemal'in: ‘Müsaadenizle ben bir dakika Abdülhamit'e uğrayacağım;’ diyerek istasyon ayakyoluna gidişi yok mu; Doktor Hikmet'e, adeta bir kıyamın, bir ihtilal hareketinin ilk adımı gibi geldi.” (Karaosmanoğlu 45-46).

Constitutional monarchy or constitutional democracy? This crucial question can be reckoned as a key expression to outline and emphasize the discrepancy between the standpoints of Young Ottomans who paved the way for the declaration of the First Constitutional Era (Birinci Meşrutiyet) in 1876 and Jeunes Turcs whose both theoretical and practical stimulative vigour led to the proclamation of the Second Constitutional Era (İkinci Meşrutiyet) in 1908. In *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı* İlber Ortaylı points out the subtle difference hinted at in the question asked above: “Yeni Osmanlıların siyasi fikirleri daha çok anayasal monarşi etrafında toplanmaktaydı. ... En azından ilk kuşak Osmanlı aydını, ikinci Meşrutiyet'i gerçekleştiren Jön Türklerden daha gelenekçi düşünce kalıplarına sahiptiler.” (Ortaylı 264-266).

Jeunes Turcs who “hadde sin opprinnelse i hemmelige foreninger bestående av progressive studenter og militære kadetter” (<http://no.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ungtyrkerne>) (took their roots/were rooted in furtive associations consisting of progressive students and military cadets.) laid the foundations of the Committee of



Union and Progress (İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti) under the name of a secret society called the Committee of Ottoman Union (İttihad-ı Osmani Cemiyeti). The founders of this initial secret association were a number of medical students involving notably Abdullah Cevdet. "Yurt içinde başlayıp bir bölümünün yakalanması üzerine 1895'ten sonra yurtdışına kayan Jön Türk hareketi bu kez daha geniş bir kesimi kucakladı." (Temel Britannica, Volume 9, 224). In this respect, as is also vividly illustrated in *Bir Sürgün*, Paris turned out to be an enthralling, shining apogee of attraction for the Ottoman intelligentsia represented by Jeunes Turcs. However, not before 1906 was this secret union transformed into a palpable political organization. The declaration of the Second Constitutional Era or Young Turk Revolution in 1908, accomplished merely two years after the official foundation as a political initiative, tangibly consolidated Committee of Union and Progress's leading role as a central political party moulding the Ottoman state policy as well as later on even – to a sizeable extent – the humanitarian feminist-sensitivity-characterized Turkish Enlightenment aiming at the attainment of a great Intellectual Revolution, in a sense evocative of Renaissance and Reformation in terms of importance, under the leadership of the philanthrope Mustafa Kemal Atatürk.

In *Bir Sürgün (An Exile)* Karaosmanoğlu skillfully explores the questions of identity, alienation, and cultural hegemony engaging the Jeunes Turcs in the early years of twentieth century's first decade through a detailed characterization of his pathetic protagonist Doktor Hikmet within a time span extending over approximately one year roughly between the summer of 1904 and the summer of 1905. Atilla Özkırmımlı points out the Jeunes-Turcs-focused historical context of the novel in the foreword section of *Bir Sürgün (An Exile)* titled "Bir Sürgün Üzerine" with the following statement: "Meşrutiyet'in gerçekleşmesinde önemlice payları olan Jön Türkler, bunların Paris'teki yaşayışları ve eylemleri romanın çatısını oluşturur" (Özkırmımlı 13). Just as Virginia Woolf gives vent to the explication and elucidation of the whole life of her female protagonist essentially suffering from harsh confrontation with her past, lost female identity, and suppressed desires within a single day by means of the innovative stream of consciousness technique in *Mrs. Dalloway*, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu illustrates the partly intricate, partly intriguing, and mostly melancholic atmosphere surrounding the Jeunes Turcs obliged to live in Paris -straddling the two 'worlds' (Eastern and Western) – , who had assumed a significant role in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in the Turkish history, by focusing on his protagonist Doktor Hikmet's 'adventures' as well as psychology, within a time span of a single year, as is also mentioned by Baha Dürder in "Türk Edebiyatında Bir Sürgün" section following the novel in the book: "Bir Sürgün'de de, romanın kahramanı olan Doktor Hikmet'in maceralarını anlatmak vesilesile, memleketin istibdat idaresi altında ezildiği sıralarda, hariçteki Jön Türk'lerin hangi emel ve fikirlerle çalıştıkları sathi de olsa gösterilmiştir." (Dürder 343).

Doktor Hikmet, who is on an "exile" in İzmir (which conspicuously sounds like a huge unmatched reward rather than an exile considered in accordance with the circumstances of contemporary times and sparkling enchanting beauty of the city), is a highly-cultivated distinguished Francophone intellectual doctor of medicine in his mid-twenties. As can easily be derived from this brief outline of Doktor Hikmet's 'outward' characterization, he is a consummate depiction of an average Jeune Turc despite his reluctance to be "officially" labelled as a Jeune Turc. In İzmir he feels ensnared in a vicious circle (which again resounds totally



and offensively Greek to me!) like those human beings rotting to their damp reeking deaths entangled under the fatal spell of those malignant fungi in one of *X-Files* series. His 'spleen' – depression – seems to have extended to such a tormenting stage that he feels even more abject than a tiny ant struggling and circling in the leers of his beer mug: “Ben de tıpkı bu karınca gibiyim. Daracık bir hayat içinde dönüp duruyorum, dönüp duruyorum. ... Bu mahluk, hiç değilse, hep aynı noktada dönüp dolaştığının farkında değil. Sonra kurtulmak için bu ıslak duvarı delip çıkmağa çabılıyor. Demek ki bir gayesi var. Ben bundan bile mahrumum.” (Karaosmanoğlu 23).

As is dimly implied in the extract given above, identity problem dangling in the minds of Jeunes Turcs excruciates Doktor Hikmet from the early pages onwards till its agonizing settlement at the finale of the novel with an unspeakably prostrating frustration marked by his death. In “Bir Sürgün Üzerine” Atilla Özkırmırlı emphasizes Doktor Hikmet's dilemma revolving around his identity as the major motive of his tragic end: “Doktor Hikmet . . . Batı'ya hayran ama Doğu'dan da kopamamış Osmanlı aydınının çıkmazıdır. Bu çıkmazın bireyin benliğinde yarattığı çatışma ise Batıcı aydının dramını hazırlayacaktır.” (Özkırmırlı 15). In the early pages of the novel Doktor Hikmet freely expresses sense of disdain for his Turkish-Islamic identity which he condemns as the basic fomenter stripping him of his liberty: “Doktor Hikmet bu istibdat memleketinde bir sürgün olmasa, daha doğrusu dünyaya sadece bir Türk olarak gelmemiş bulunsa, elli adımda şu rıhtımın kenarına varır, bir sandala atlar ve beş on dakika içinde kendini o vapurda, o insanların arasında bulurdu. Fakat, heyhat!” (Karaosmanoğlu 24). In the following statement the notion of smothering and strangling captivation suffocating Doktor Hikmet to a lung-tearing choking irrevocably emanating from his condemned “deprecatory” Turkish identity manifests itself most saliently like an intimidating banging of gongs chillingly echoing mingled with the hissing whisper of whirling and twirling wind among the gargantuan cragged gravestones with gritty scrubby Runic engravings on epitaphs in a solemn secluded ancient Viking cemetery on an untrodden tempestuous promontory of Fugloy where even in broad daylight the hoot of ominous owls muffles the screeches of misnavigated serene Southern seagulls: “İzmir, Türkiye denilen zindanın hür ülkelere doğru aralık kalmış bir kapısıydı. Buradan sıvışıp kaçmak imkanını bütün Doktor Hikmet'ler yüreklerinde bir beraat ümidi gibi taşıyordu.” (Karaosmanoğlu 27). In this quotation “Doktor Hikmet'ler” definitely refers to Jeunes Turcs encumbered with the “burden” of Eastern identity they consider themselves to be inflicted with just like a woeful leper feeling obliged to shy away from the accompaniment of others as though s/he were some blatant beast bedevilling their bliss due to tremendous tarnished tissues on his/her bone-dry skin. In this regard, it should be noted that Doktor Hikmet's aversion to the Eastern identity stuck on his forehead like a scary seal consists in its religious rather than national or ethnic aspect. Indeed the knack of the identity problem he is confronted with rests in suppressive, insensitive, reactionary, misogynistic indoctrinations coercively imposed on young, cultivated, relatively anti-sexist Ottoman intellectuals by the religion. In this respect, religious rather than national aspect of his identity pecks at the genesis of his soul like a chomping rat and thus nibbles away at his joy of life in a sense evocative of dementors draining off Harry Potter's contentment in J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. That Doktor Hikmet replaces his fez with a Panaman hat as soon as the



Nigere arrives at the port of Piraeus can be affirmed as a piece of evidence demonstrating his discontent with particularly religious aspect of his Eastern identity: "Sanki başından attığı fesle beraber bütün kara düşüncelerini, bütün pesimizmasını kafasının içinden söküp atmıştı." (Karaosmanoğlu 47). Prior to this incident, aboard the ship on his voyage from İzmir to Paris, the following statement of one of the Levantine voyagers can be proffered as an evident denunciation of Islamic identity through the dignification of Christian or at least non-Islamic identity which – in a sense – lends voice to Doktor Hikmet's inner contemplation regarding the identity problem he encounters: ". . . İstanbul'da olsun, İzmir'de olsun, gelip geçerken şöyle medeniyet namına ne görüyorsanız bunların hepsi Hristiyan unsurların eseridir. Türkiye'den Rumu, Ermeniye ve Avrupalıları kaldırırsınız, bütün memlekette ne yatacak bir tek otel, ne oturacak bir tek gazino ne de bir mendil almak için tek bir mağaza bulursunuz. . . ." (Karaosmanoğlu 34-35). In *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki* Sina Akşin comes up with a remark accounting for the criticism broached by the Levantine passenger in the extract above by underlining the lack of a commercially and industrially creative identity among Turks during that age: ". . . Batı Emperyalizminin ve onun kompradorluğunu yapan azınlıkların ağır baskısı karşısında, Selanikliler gibi tecrübeli ve yakın dayanışma içinde olmayan diğer Türklerin ticaret ve sanayide herhangi bir ciddi atılım yapmaları son derece zordu." (Akşin 81). After his arrival in France during his early days in Paris his Eastern identity keeps on pestering Doktor Hikmet as he gets embarrassed when he is exposed to questions inquiring after his nationality: "Milliyetini ise, adeta bir ayıp gibi saklıyordu. Ona 'sen nerelisin?' diye sorulduğu vakit şaşırıp kalıyor, bir müddet kekeliyor, sonra akla gelmeyen bir memleketin adını söylüyordu." (Karaosmanoğlu 105).

As is also supported by historical reality, in *Bir Sürgün* Karaosmanoğlu depicts Paris as the chief domain or capital of Jeunes Turcs diaspora: " 'A, evet, Fransa bunlarla doludur,' dedi. 'Merkezi komiteleri Paris'tedir. ... Hepsi Fransızca bilir, hepsi Fransız kültürü almıştır, bizim mekteplerde okumuştur . . .'" (Karaosmanoğlu 34). Just like the case for other Jeunes Turcs, Doktor Hikmet – a vehement admirer of Western Civilization – is innately grasped by an exalted, apotheosized opinion of Paris which he deems as the zenith of the superior glimmering European Civilization. In this regard, it can readily be argued that Paris along with French culture and literature in a wider sense manifests itself as the major token of cultural hegemony that allures Doktor Hikmet – like other Jeunes Turcs – to depart from his home and move to France. European cultural hegemony asserts itself in the very first pages of the novel as implanted in Doktor Hikmet's over-romanticized assessment of French language: ". . . ona göre Fransız diliyle basılmış bir dizi, hatta basbayağı bir bakkal ilanı bile olsa 'mukaddes kitaplar'ın metinleri gibi yüksek sesle ve bir hususi ahenkle okunmalıdır." (Karaosmanoğlu 22). As can be discerned in this quotation, language functions as a key instrument in the triumph of cultural hegemony. Likewise, as an outcome of language, literature serves as a medium of French cultural hegemony delineated in the novel. The sentimentalized images painted with soft serene strokes of writers' innocent brushes may deliver the reader a glorified, charming, though occasionally deceptive, perception of culture as is conveyed in Doktor Hikmet's starry-eyed reception of Paris, French Culture, Europe, and Western Civilization: ". . . "Paris", "Avrupa", "Fransız kültürü", "Garp medeniyeti" ve saire gibi mefhumlar onun beyininde o kadar 'ebstret' bir şekilde yer etmiş, o kadar akli ve dimağı bir terkip mahiyetini almıştı ki, bunları . . . ölçüp tartmağa, yoklayıp



anlamağa asla imkan bulamamıştı. . . . Hugo'dan, Balzac'tan, Bourget'ye kadar bütün bir silsile sanat dehasının menşurları, bu koca şehri, onun muhayyelesine bir feerik dünyanın parıltılı gölgesi gibi aksettirmişti.” (Karaosmanoğlu 133-134).

Nonetheless, unfortunately, almost as soon as Doktor Hikmet arrives in Paris, his over-sentimentalized adoration for France and Western Civilization begins to stutter, stumble, shatter and eventually crumbles into an irrepressible notion of 'lethargy' decisively terminated by fatal tuberculosis. In “Bir Sürgün Üzerine” Atilla Özkırımlı underlines Doktor Hikmet's disillusionment in Paris as the triggering motive of the identity dilemma he suffers from as well as his revulsion against the European Civilization: “. . . Doktor Hikmet'in hayranlığı, Paris'e geldiği günden başlayarak yalnız sarsılmakla kalmamış, yerini yeni bir arayışa bırakarak bir düşünce bunalımına düşmesine, dolayısıyla bireysel mutsuzluğa sürüklenmesine yol açmıştır.” (Özkırımlı 14). Bitter lack of identity, tormenting alienation, and the breakdown of cultural hegemony along with the revelation of its deceptive facade precipitate the miserable end of Doktor Hikmet as a pathetic protagonist. Even on his first day strolling up and down the streets of Paris, he seems to be gripped by a notion of alienation: “. . . Doktor Hikmet, daha ilk adımdan itibaren kendi yürüyüşünde umumi ahenge uymıyan, aksayan ve yabancılığını aleme ifşa eden bir şey buldu. . . . Herkes bıyık altından gülererek ona bakıyor ve 'bu acayip adam da kimdir?' diyor, gibiydi. . . . Daha ilk adımında, 'Paris' onu, o kadar yıldırılmış, o kadar cüretini kırmıştı ki, mümkün olsa gidip oteldeki odasına kapanacak ve oradan artık bir daha dışarıya çıkmayacaktı.” (Karaosmanoğlu 67-70). An amalgamation of Doktor Hikmet's lack of identity and alienation is deftly handled when he has to encounter the bitter reality that he is not even officially acknowledged as a doctor of medicine in Paris as he infers from Ali Kemal's unconcerned laugh tearing apart his fragile heart: “. . . 'Aman beyefendi,' dedi; 'ben ki, doktorluğuma güvenerek bura hastahanelerinin birinde kendime bir iş bulacağımı ümit ederken . . .' Sözünün sonu ağzında kaldı. Ali Kemal bir kahkaha daha koparmıştı.” (Karaosmanoğlu 107). After his agonizing confrontation with the reality that he is deprived of practising his profession in France, lack of identity as well as alienation sits heavy and grimly on his heart. His acquaintance with Ragıp Bey and Ragıp Bey's guileless willingness to accompany him in this massive city cannot alleviate the sense of irrepressible loneliness devouring his poor heart as is reflected in the following extract: “Milyonlarca kişilik bir insan yığını içinde, kim olduğu, nereden geldiği, nereye gideceği, ne yaptığı, ne yapacağı hiç bilinmeyen; daha doğrusu, hiç kimsenin vazifesinde olmayan yalnız ve garip bir adam . . . Ne adı o diyarın kütüğünde yazılı, ne bir mahallede kaydı var?” (Karaosmanoğlu 129). Doktor Hikmet's disillusionment induced by the loss of individual identity and estrangement is illuminated through his incapability of maintaining solid friendships with fellow students at the medical school (Ecole de Médecine) he attends. He feels hampered from the opportunity of establishing sound sincere friendships with them on grounds of an invisible barrier distancing them from him. It dawns upon Doktor Hikmet that he is entrapped in a completely foreign land no matter how closely he is acquainted with its language, literature, and culture: “Doktor Hikmet, çünkü dilini kendi dilim kadar biliyorum, çünkü edebiyatına, kültürüne kendi edebiyatımdan, kendi kültürümden ziyade vakıfım diye bu dünyaya kendi has vatanına girer gibi girmek istemişti. Fakat, şimdi, anlıyor ki bu yabancı bir dünyadır.” (Karaosmanoğlu 170). Sense of alienation stemming from an invisible social



obstacle provokes Doktor Hikmet to question the French society into which he is unable to integrate himself despite his vigorous attempts. Prof. Dr. Foissard's indifferent attitude indicating a blatant reluctance to assist Doktor Hikmet to find a medical job, insincerity as well as a sense of unreliability in his acquaintance with fellow students at Ecole de Médecine, and unemotional attitudes as well as behaviour imbued with a discernible tinge of insipidity he witnesses among those visitors while sauntering and shuffling in an attempt to 'bargain his way' through the thickening crowd along the galleries at Duchesse D'Urat's residence add acid salt to the sore spot swollen in Doktor Hikmet's spiritual sphere: "İçinden: 'Bu gördüklerimin bir kalbi, bir ruhu, bir dimağı var mı? Severler mi? Nefret, ederler mi? Gerçekten gülüp ağlayabilirler mi?' diyordu." (Karaosmanoğlu 185). In "Türk Edebiyatında Bir Sürgün" D. A. draws the reader's attention to Doktor Hikmet's disapproval of insincerity and opportunism he (Doktor Hikmet) observes prevalently among the French people: "[Doktor Hikmet] en mühim noksan olarak Fransızlarda samimiyetsizlik ve menfaat kollayıcılık taraflarını buluyor." (D. A. 344).

It is worth mentioning that sense of isolation, spiritual barrenness, and alienation that Doktor Hikmet suffers from is not peculiar to him as he observes a similar estrangement among Jeunes Turcs in Paris detaching them from being integrated into the French society despite their Francophile dispositions kindled by a vehement admiration of European Civilization and "bu medeniyete dair kalıplaşmış birtakım kanaatler" (Karaosmanoğlu 175): ". . . Jeune Turc'ler, o kadar kendi aralarında, kendi muhitlerinde mahsur yaşamaktadırlar ve bütün ferenkperestliklerine rağmen frenklerle o kadar az ülfet etmektedirler ki, bunların adet ve seciyelerine, daha umumi surette, garp aleminin strüktürüne dair bir fikir ve malumat edinmiş olmalarının ihtimali yoktur." (Karaosmanoğlu 175). Alienation as a repercussion of dispute springing from opportunism manifests itself even among Jeunes Turcs as can distinctly be observed in Ragıp Bey's castigation of them regarding their incapability of taking action due to – as is implicitly suggested – opportunistic concerns they are obsessed with: "Geçenlerde sözüm ona bir 'Jeune Turc' konferansı yapalım dediler, ağızlarına yüzlerine bulaştırdılar. Ne imiş o? Sen Prens Sabahattin Bey taraftarı imişsin; ben Ahmet Rıza Bey taraftarı imişim. A efendim, aramızda hiç de vatan, millet taraftarı olan yok mu? Her gün vatan, millet diye hant hant ötersiniz, vatan, millet yolundaki fedakarlığınızı, feragatinizi ne vakit göstereceksiniz? Şimdiden yer kavgası." (Karaosmanoğlu 92).

In Paris Doktor Hikmet falls in love with a young girl called Arlette, who is poet Jean Lavalier's daughter. Nevertheless, as an introvert and fairly shy person, Doktor Hikmet cannot freely declare his love to Arlette. Once again alienation - this time in an emotional rather than social sense - emerges as an unbudgeable hurdle between them due to - as is insinuated - diverse cultural and national identities they bear. Even though Arlette endeavours to remove this emotional (and needless to mention; sexual) barrier between them, Doktor Hikmet cannot dare support Arlette in her attempt: ". . . geçen akşam, Arlette'in eli karanlıkta kendi elini sıkarken aralarındaki bu mesafe bir uçurum gibi derinleşmişti." (Karaosmanoğlu 255). Emotional alienation with blurred, though impressive connotation of Freudian Oedipus Complex, asserts itself in Doktor Hikmet's comparison of



Arlette's mother and his own mother Pakize Hanım where he denounces Arlette's mother as an impertinent mother figure, whereas, he glorifies his own mother as an affectionate decent mother figure. Thereby, Doktor Hikmet renders - in an arguably a bit far-fetched sense - a comparison between mother-identities of two different cultures: "Kendi anası ve bu kadın!... Hey Yarabbim, aradaki fark ne müthişti!... Kendi anası ne kadar nazlı, tatlı ve yumuşak idiyse, bu kadın o kadar sert ve carizdi. Kendi anasında tevazula vekar ne kadar birbirine karışmış iki esas fazilet ise, bunda küstahlık ve bayağılık o kadar göze çarpan bir hususiyetti." (Karaosmanoğlu 251). In one of his conversations with Arlette, Doktor Hikmet abruptly gives vent to his reprehension of the French society in an attempt to challenge French cultural hegemony – he has previously been cherishing before moving to France in an over-sentimental manner – as he pours out his contempt for its depressing artificiality drawing off the whole joy of life: ". . . Ve size acıyorum. Bütün hayatınız ne kadar değersiz, ne kadar yapma hummalar içinde yıpranıp gidiyor diye . . . Ve gene görüyorum ki, siz başka türlü yaşayamazsınız. Bu cemiyetin içinde, bu cemiyetin katı ve merhametsiz şartları içinde, yalnız gönlün saiklerine göre hesapsız kitapsız bir yaşayış ancak bir hezimet tazammun eder." (Karaosmanoğlu 258). As is vividly illustrated in this quotation, Doktor Hikmet comes up with a clear distinction between his own identity and the French identity he has once hankered after internalizing. He no longer condescends to kneel down submissively before the Western identity and European cultural hegemony. On the contrary, Doktor Hikmet cannot help courageously challenging the superiority of Western Civilization: "Hele şu Avrupalıların, kendilerini dünyanın mütekamil, en ala bir insanlık örneği zannetmelerine, Doktor Hikmet, artık hiç dayanamıyordu" (Karaosmanoğlu 299). In "Türk Edebiyatında Bir Sürgün" İsmail Habip Sevük accords emphasis to the criticism of Paris and Parisians on behalf of France and the French society highlighting Bir Sürgün: "Paris'te geçen Bir Sürgün Paris'e ve Parisli'ye bir hicviyedir." (Sevük 345).

Towards the end of the novel, Arlette, who coincidentally witnesses – or at least hears or rather eavesdrops – Doktor Hikmet's being dismissed from his flat by the landlord owing to the unpaid rent of last two months, deserts him on that very spot and thus hits the final stroke to the pitiable protagonist whose mere hope of spiritual redemption has rested on a union with her. From that moment onwards he experiences a complete estrangement from his environment. His rapidly deteriorating health condition due to intensifying unbearable fever fits occasioned by fatal tuberculosis drags Doktor Hikmet to a miserable discomfoting death just as Achilles trails off Hector's corpse across the field to posthumous degradation in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*. Throes of an abject death begin to nag at Doktor Hikmet irritatingly and contributes to his overwhelming anguish: "Ölmek! Ve bu sefil odada, bu sefil yatağın içinde?" (Karaosmanoğlu 328). Doktor Hikmet's alienation aggravates his detachment from Jeunes Turcs as well since he plainly reckons them as fomenters of his misery by – in a sense – their tempting him to move to France with sweetened artificial charms of Western Civilization. He no longer regards them as "friends" or "comrades" – including Ragıp Bey when he observes that even Ragıp Bey's ideas bear parallelism with those of Abdülhamit-II as he (Ragıp Bey) plainly states that "Haniya, o günler, monşer! Bir paylaşsalar da biz de kurtulsak dünya da . . ." (Karaosmanoğlu 327): " 'Burada vatandaşlarınızdan hiçbir dostunuz, bir tanıdığınız yok mu?' diye sorduğu vakit, o, sadece:



'Hayır!' cevabını verdi. . . . [B]unlar bir alay yalancısıdır ve yalanları, o kadar tehlikelidir ki, işte, benim gibi bir zavallıyı yerinden, yurdundan eder ve bu kara akibete mahkum kılar. Zira, beni, hiç yoktan, bir facianın kahramanı yapan onlardır." (Karaosmanoğlu 327-334). During his last days Doktor Hikmet finds mere consolation in Doktor Pienot's compassion. Doktor Pienot can simply be described as a paragon of virtue embodying benevolence, mercy, and sensitivity. Besides, he is characterized by a remarkably reasonable disposition along with a meritorious efficiency in the practice of his profession as a doctor of medicine like Doktor Hikmet. Just like Doktor Hikmet and other Jeunes Turcs, he is – at crucial moments – treated as an alien(!) in the French society on grounds of his Jewish identity. Namely, just like Doktor Hikmet, though not as intensely and intensively as him, Doktor Pienot has occasionally suffered from alienation due to his religious identity, as well throughout his sixty years of life. In this respect, Doktor Hikmet and Doktor Pienot easily sympathize with each other like old friends. Like Doktor Hikmet, Doktor Pienot is a challenger of Western Civilization's cultural hegemony as can be discerned in this example where Doktor Pienot inveighs against uncaring, ostentatious health policy of France as he cannot persuade any hospital or health clinic authority to provide Doktor Hikmet with bedded treatment: " 'Gördünüz mü bir kere garp medeniyetini?' dedi. 'Parasız ve kimsesiz bir hastaya insanca tedavi imkanını bile vermiyor.'" (Karaosmanoğlu 328). Doktor Pienot elaborates on chiding Western Civilization by putting the emphasis on the European's avaricious lust: "Lakin, Avrupalıyı kazanız, altında daima o sert küherçileyi bulacaksınız. O hiç gözü doymayan, iştihası dinmeyen yırtıcı mahluku bulacaksınız." (Karaosmanoğlu 330-331).

Eventually, Doktor Hikmet passes away in agony at compassionate Doktor Pienot's home as a miserable broken homesick man with no proper identity, absolutely alienated among the shattered splinters of corroded cultural hegemony like a shrivelled shrunk chrysanthemum stiffened with austere untimely death reigning over that forgotten Viking cemetery overgrown with Nordic grass on Fugloy, deprived of the dignity of being buried in an individual marked grave: "Doktor Hikmet'in cesedi, toprak parası bulunup verilemediğinden Paris'in umumi kuburlarından birine gömüldü." (Karaosmanoğlu 342).

Concludingly, as has been meant to be expatiated on throughout this paper, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu's *Bir Sürgün (An Exile)*, set against the backdrop of a "live, throbbing age, / that brawls, cheats, maddens, calculates, aspires, / and spends more passion, more heroic heat" (*Aurora Leigh, Book-V*) where Jeunes Turcs, though portrayed as smudged with futility and negligence in the novel, assume a remarkable role as 'angry young men' endowed with proper intellect and creative inspiration to overthrow the spoilt, misogynistic, tyrannical Ottoman Sultanate and establish a brand new constitutional democracy in stead, quite realistically delineates the heart-rending tragedy of a pathetic 'jeune turc' called Doktor Hikmet in the early 1900s with particular regard to the exploration of three major topics that can be enumerated as identity, alienation, and cultural hegemony. Unlike the promising, auspicious prospect conjectured by Jeunes Turcs' hot-tempered, ardent, and inspiring nature, in his novel Karaosmanoğlu introduces the reader rather a pessimistic assessment of the Age as well as Jeunes Turcs. In this regard, brief and impressive statement uttered by William Golding to wrap up



the major theme of his appreciably symbolical, renowned novel *Lord of the Flies* can appropriately be applied to sum up the main emotion prevalent in Yakup Kadri Karaosmanođlu's depressing *Bir Sürgün*:

“Grief, sheer grief, grief, grief, grief.”

William Golding



WORKS CITED

Akşin, Sina. *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1987.

Boyd, S.J. *The Novels of William Golding*. New York; London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990.

D. A. "Türk Edebiyatında *Bir Sürgün*." Bir Sürgün. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003. 344-345.

Dürder, Baha. "Türk Edebiyatında *Bir Sürgün*." Bir Sürgün. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003. 343.

Greenblatt, Stephen, gen. ed. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 9th ed. Vol. 2. New York: Norton, 2012.

Mardin, Şerif. *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*. Princeton, New Jersey: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

Ortaylı, İlber. *Gelenekten Geleceğe*. İstanbul: Alkım Kitabevi, 2007.

Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: Alkım Kitabevi, 2006.

Özkırımlı, Atilla. "*Bir Sürgün Üzerine*." Bir Sürgün. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003. 13-17.

Sevük, İsmail Habip. "Türk Edebiyatında *Bir Sürgün*." Bir Sürgün. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003. 345-346.

"Jön Türkler." Temel Britannica. Cilt-9. 224.

<http://lernportal.the-unwanted.com>

<http://no.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ungtyrkerne>

